

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 remain pending herein. Claim 5 has been rewritten to be in independent form.

1. The statement by the Examiner that claims 6 and 7 contain allowable subject matter is acknowledged and appreciated by Applicants. In accordance with that statement, the subject matter of claim 6 has been incorporated into claim 1, rendering at least claims 1-4 and 7-9 allowable.

2. Claims 4 and 6 were objected to for informalities. Applicants submit that this objection is overcome in light of the amendments herein to the present claims.

3. Claims 1-2, 4 and 9 were rejection under §103 over Maguire et al. in view of Hales et al. and Scott et al. Claims 3 and 8 were rejected under §103 in further view of Edgerton. The foregoing art rejections are moot in view of the incorporation of the subject matter of claim 6 into claim 1.

4. Claim 4 was rejected over the foregoing references in view of Warner et al. It is noted that while Claim 4 is mentioned in the Office Action, it appears that the PTO is rejecting claim 5 under this rejection. In this respect, the attention of the PTO is drawn to new independent claim 22, which contains the subject matter of original claims 1 and 5.

Claim 22 recites a multi-chamber vacuum coating apparatus for coating a substrate tape utilizing PLD. According to the claimed apparatus, a target manipulator supports multiple targets arranged in a linear fashion, the target manipulator imparting rotary and oscillatory motion to the targets. In this respect, an embodiment of the foregoing arrangement is shown in present FIG. 5a. The linear arrangement of the multiple target is a particularly notable feature of the claimed invention, and provides for an extended linear deposition zone for the substrate passing therealong, and provides multiple overlapping plumes along the extended deposition zone (as claimed). Such an arrangement is nowhere disclosed or even remotely suggested by the references of record. In this respect, Warner et al. is limited to multiple deposition chambers having targets arranged in a circular fashion, rather than multiple targets arranged along a line. A modification to the multiple target arrangement of Warner et al. is not even remotely suggested by the references of record. Accordingly, independent claim 22 recites additional patentable subject matter.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 22 would not have been obvious over Maguire et al., Hales et al., Scott et al., and Warner et al. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the foregoing art rejection are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.


Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the Applicants would be desirable for placing this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-2469.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

7/22/05


Jeffrey S. Abel, Reg. No. 36,079

Attorney for Applicant(s)

TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.

5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265

Austin, Texas 78746

(512) 327-5515 (phone) (512) 327-5452 (fax)